

REMARKS

Claims 23-44 are pending. In the Office Action mailed on October 17, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 23-44 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0174211 to Hoellerer et al. ("Hoellerer"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 23-31 and 39-43 recite "placing a first line on an electronic drawing sheet, the first line representing a first time interval and including a first set of project events" and "receiving an indication of a selection of a portion of the first line that represents a second time interval within the first time interval." The Examiner relies on Hoellerer's discussion of adding or deleting events from a map at paragraph [0079] as disclosing the indication of a selection of a portion of the first line that represents a second time interval within the first time interval. Applicants respectfully disagree. Hoellerer merely states that "when an event is added to the map, a note 212 with the name of location is added to the bulletin board 210 and a query may be launched." (Hoellerer, [0079].) The Examiner has not pointed to, and Applicants are unable to find, anything in Hoellerer's discussion of the depiction of the location of events at paragraph [0079] that could possibly correspond to Applicants' receiving an indication of a selection of a portion of the first line that represents a second time interval within the first time interval, as recited by these claims.

Claims 23-31 and 39-43 also recite "placing a second line on the electronic drawing sheet corresponding to the second time interval, the second line representing an expanded view of the second time interval and including a second set of project events corresponding to the first set of project events." The Examiner relies on Hoellerer's discussion regarding Fig. 10 at paragraph [0105] as disclosing the placing of a second line on the electronic drawing sheet corresponding to the second time interval, where the second line represents an expanded view of the second time interval and includes a second set of project events corresponding to the first set of project events. Applicants respectfully disagree. As noted by the Examiner, Fig. 10 of Hoellerer discloses a data

structure that includes records which correspond to alternative trip plans. (Hoellerer, [0105].) First, Applicants are perplexed as to how a data structure can disclose the placing of a second line on an electronic drawing sheet. Second, although Hoellerer describes a calendar window (Hoellerer, Fig. 3, [0076]-[0078]), Hoellerer clearly indicates that the trip plans that are displayed in the calendar window are alternative trip plans, and that the data structure depicted in Fig. 10 contains records that correspond to alternative trip plans. (emphasis added) (Hoellerer, Fig. 3, [0076]-[0078], Fig. 10, [0105].) Applicants are unable to find anything in Hoellerer's discussion of the calendar window or the data structure of Fig. 10 that could possibly correspond to placing a second line on the electronic drawing sheet corresponding to the second time interval, the second line representing an expanded view of the second time interval and including a second set of project events corresponding to the first set of project events, as recited by these claims.

Claims 32-34 recite "dynamically-linking the second line to the first line such that the second line is associated with a portion of the first line and represents an expanded view of the associated portion of the first line." Claims 35-38 similarly recite "dynamically-linking the second line to the selected portion of the first line, wherein the second line represents an expanded view of the associated portion of the first line." The Examiner rejected these claims by merely stating that the rejection of these claims is similar to the rejection of claim 23. (Office Action, p. 5.) Applicants respectfully disagree. As discussed above, Hoellerer clearly indicates that alternative trip plans are displayed in the calendar window, and that the records contained in the data structure depicted in Fig. 10 correspond to alternative trip plans. (emphasis added) (Hoellerer, Fig. 3, [0076]-[0078], Fig. 10, [0105].) Although Hoellerer describes visually linking information in the various windows, the visual link is generated between information in each window related to the event. (Hoellerer, [0127].) Hoellerer specifically explains that, "for each event, a visual link is generated between information in each window related to the event." (Id.) This amounts to an event in one window being visually linked to the event in another window. This is in contrast to dynamically-linking the second line [having a second project event] to the first line [having

a first project event] such that the second line is associated with a portion of the first line and represents an expanded view of the associated portion of the first line, as recited by these claims.

Claim 44 recites "a component for allowing user selection of a portion of the first line that represents a second time interval within the first time interval and dynamically-linking the selected portion to the second line, wherein the second line represents an expanded view of the second time interval." The Examiner rejected this claim by merely stating that the rejection of this claim is similar to the rejection of claim 23. (Office Action, p. 5.) Applicants respectfully disagree. As discussed above, the Examiner has not pointed to, and Applicants are unable to find, anything in Hoellerer's discussion of the calendar window, the data structure of Fig. 10, and the visual linking of information in the various windows that could possibly correspond to Applicants' component for allowing user selection of a portion of the first line that represents a second time interval within the first time interval and dynamically-linking the selected portion to the second line, wherein the second line represents an expanded view of the second time interval, as recited by these claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 23-44 are allowable and ask that this application be passed to allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or believes that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned representative at (206) 359-8000.

Dated:

12/14/06

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Do Te Kim

Registration No.: 46,231

PERKINS COIE LLP

P.O. Box 1247

Seattle, Washington 98111-1247

(206) 359-8000

Attorney for Applicant